

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspfo.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Lany C. McNeff 10/650,496 08/28/2003 7449.15US01 6962 EXAMINER 7590 12/29/2004 Merchant & Gould P.C. SAYALA, CHRAYA D P.O. Box 2903 ART UNIT Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903 PAPER NUMBER 1761

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			217
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/650,496	MCNEFF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. SAYALA	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	SS
Period for R ply	V IO OET TO EVENE A MA	ONTHIO) FROM	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply lif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply received by the office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re y within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commandered (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ers, prosecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	•	
Disposition of Claims			
. 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application		•	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2003 is/are:		iected to by the Evaminer	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•		1 121(4)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,		` '
			.02.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority document			•
2. Certified copies of the priority document			,
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	received in this National Sta	age
application from the International Bureau	` ' ' '		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not	receivea.	
		~	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —-	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	 ·	formal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:	•	

Application/Control Number: 10/650,496

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticpated by HU 61443.

The abstract teaches detoxification mold and micro toxin decontamination by combining grain fodder with hydrogen peroxide.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin (US Patent 137743) in view of Chen (US Patent 5641530), Dalmasso et al. (US Patent 5460845) and HU 61443.

Application/Control Number: 10/650,496

Art Unit: 1761

Austin teaches spraying as a mist, grains that are used as feed with a disinfectant to remove fungus spores. The reference does not teach that the disinfectant is hydrogen peroxide or its amounts.

Chen (US Patent 5641530) teaches disinfecting food stuff using hydrogen peroxide. At col. 4, lines 4-5, Chen states that the "germicide effect of hydrogen peroxide has been well recognized". Concentrations are shown at col. 2, lines 30-35.

Dalmasso et al. (US Patent 5460845) teach a method decontaminating seeds, grains, etc. of molds, yeast and fungi by using hydrogen peroxide. (col. 1, lines 15-20 and lines 65-67). The patent teaches that the liquid hydrogen peroxide concentration is 25-70%. Although the patent teaches the use of H₂O₂ as a vapor, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, would reasonably expect that since a compound and its properties are inseparable, the germicidal property of H₂O₂ would be the same, liquid or vapor. Furthermore, the prior art applied recognizes that liquid peroxide is disinfectant for feedstuff with respect to fungus etc. It would have been obvious to the artisan that the applied references, as a whole, teach that hydrogen peroxide is disinfectant for feedstuff, grains, etc., that it was known to spray a mist of the disinfectant over feedstuff and the concentrations shown between 20-70% by '845 would depend on the amount of grain to be disinfected and the extent of contamination expected because of the quality and length of storage. Note that HU 61443 already establishes that it was known in the art that grain fodder contaminated with mold or microtoxins can be detoxified by hydrogen peroxide and the availability of such art and

Application/Control Number: 10/650,496 Page 4

Art Unit: 1761

knowledge would have been available to the practitioner who is looking to preserve grains, even distiller's grains from mold and/or fungus.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. SAÝALA Primary Examiner

Group 1700.